

Citation for published version:

Wilson, C, King, MA & Yeadon, MR 2011, 'The effects of initial conditions and takeoff technique on running jumps for height and distance', *Journal of Biomechanics*, vol. 44, no. 12, pp. 2207-2212.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2011.06.010>

DOI:

[10.1016/j.jbiomech.2011.06.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2011.06.010)

Publication date:

2011

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

NOTICE: this is the author's version of a work that was accepted for publication in Journal of Biomechanics. Changes resulting from the publishing process, such as peer review, editing, corrections, structural formatting, and other quality control mechanisms may not be reflected in this document. Changes may have been made to this work since it was submitted for publication. A definitive version was subsequently published in Journal of Biomechanics, vol 44, issue 12, 2011, DOI 10.1016/j.jbiomech.2011.06.010

University of Bath

Alternative formats

If you require this document in an alternative format, please contact:
openaccess@bath.ac.uk

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

**The effects of initial conditions and takeoff technique on
running jumps for height and distance**

Cassie Wilson¹, Mark A. King² and Maurice R. Yeadon²

¹ Department for Health, University of Bath, Bath, BA2 7AY, UK.

² School of Sport, Exercise and Health Sciences, Loughborough University,
Loughborough LE11 3TU, UK.

Keywords: running jumps, initial conditions, takeoff technique

Word count: 3138 Abstract: 216

Re-submitted to: Journal of Biomechanics, April 2011.

Address for correspondence

Dr M.A. King
School of Sport, Exercise and Health Sciences,
Loughborough University,
Loughborough,
LE11 3TU
UK

email: M.A.King@lboro.ac.uk

tel: +44 (0) 1509 226326

fax: +44 (0) 1509 226301

Abstract

This study used a subject-specific model with eight segments driven by joint torques for forward dynamics simulation to investigate the effects of initial conditions and takeoff technique on the performance of running jumps for height and distance. The torque activation profiles were varied in order to obtain matching simulations for two jumping performances (one for height and one for distance) by an elite male high jumper, resulting in a simulated peak height of 1.98 m and a simulated horizontal distance of 4.38 m. The peak height reached / horizontal distance travelled by the mass centre for the same corresponding initial conditions were then maximized by varying the activation timings resulting in a peak height of 2.09 m and a horizontal distance of 4.67 m. In a further two optimizations the initial conditions were interchanged giving a peak height of 1.78 m and a horizontal distance of 4.03 m. The four optimized simulations show that even with similar approach speeds the initial conditions at touchdown have a substantial effect on the resulting performance. Whilst the takeoff phase is clearly important, unless the approach phase and the subsequent touchdown conditions are close to optimal then a jumper will be unable to compensate for touchdown condition shortcomings during the short takeoff phase to achieve a performance close to optimum.

57 **Introduction**

58 Running jumps are an integral part of many activities and can be generally
59 considered to consist of three main phases: the approach, the takeoff and the
60 flight phase (Greig and Yeadon, 2000). The takeoff is considered to be the
61 most important of the three phases while the approach phase is vital for its
62 preparation (Dapena, 1988). The main purpose of the approach phase is
63 therefore to place the athlete in the optimum initial conditions for the takeoff
64 phase. Due to the specific requirements of high jumping and long jumping
65 there are differences in athletes' optimal initial conditions. The optimal
66 approach speed for long jumping is faster than for high jumping where an
67 'intermediate' approach speed is optimal (Greig and Yeadon, 2000;
68 Alexander, 1990). Using a theoretical model, Alexander (1990) found that
69 long jumping has a steeper optimum plant angle (the angle between the
70 backward horizontal and the line joining the ankle and hip of the takeoff leg)
71 than in high jumping where the optimum plant angle is closer to the horizontal.
72 The shallower plant angle utilised by high jumpers facilitates the production of
73 vertical velocity. The steeper plant angle utilised in long jumping allows the
74 athlete to gain vertical velocity whilst maintaining a fast horizontal velocity
75 (Hay, 1981). Theoretically a straight plant leg is optimal for both high jumping
76 (Grieg and Yeadon, 2000) and long jumping (Seyfarth et al., 2000) and a
77 greater backward lean of the trunk at touchdown is needed for high jumping
78 (Dapena, 1988), while in long jumping the trunk angle is closer to vertical
79 (Graham-Smith and Lees, 2005).

80

Differences primarily in initial conditions at touchdown lead to a shorter takeoff phase of around 120 ms for long jumping (Seyfarth et al., 2000; Bridgett and Linthorne, 2006) compared to a longer contact time of around 180 ms for high jumping (Aura and Vittasalo, 1989). During the takeoff phase high jumpers try to maximise gain in vertical velocity (Greig and Yeadon, 2000) while long jumpers attempt to develop vertical velocity whilst limiting the inevitable loss in horizontal velocity (van Don and Hay, 1994). The amount of knee flexion of the takeoff leg during the final contact phase has been identified as one of the factors that influence the production of vertical velocity (Dapena, 1980). In the high jump the knee joint flexes to an angle in the region of 133° (Dapena, 1980) whereas in the long jump the knee flexes to approximately 140° (Graham-Smith and Lees, 2005), although the effect of different approach speeds on knee kinematics in each type of jump is not clear.

It is clear that both the approach phase (initial conditions at touchdown) and the takeoff phase are critical for a successful performance of a running jump for height or distance. The relationship between these two phases is complex with it not being clear what effect changes in takeoff technique can have on performance for a particular combination of approach characteristics. The purpose of this study was to use a theoretical simulation model to investigate the relative effects of initial conditions and takeoff technique on running jumps for height and distance.

Methods

105 An international male high jumper of height 1.89 m and mass 82 kg, with a
106 personal competition best of 2.31 m was used as the subject in the study.
107 The athlete gave informed consent for the procedures which were carried out
108 in accordance with the protocol approved by Loughborough University Ethical
109 Advisory Committee. Ninety-five anthropometric measurements were taken
110 on the athlete and segmental inertia parameters were calculated using the
111 geometric inertia model of Yeadon (1990b). The athlete was requested to
112 perform a high jumping and a long jumping performance with similar approach
113 speeds. Both performances were recorded at a frequency of 200 Hz using
114 two video cameras (50-Hz Sony digital Handycam VX1000 camera and a
115 NAC high-speed HSV-400 video camera; Wilson et al., 2006). Fifteen body
116 landmarks (wrist, elbow, shoulder, hip, knee, ankle and toe joint centres of
117 both sides of the body, plus the centre of the head) were manually digitized
118 and were reconstructed using the Direct Linear Transformation algorithm
119 (Karara, 1980) with camera synchronisation effected using the digitised
120 landmark data (Yeadon and King, 1999). The coordinate data and the inertia
121 data were used to calculate the jumper's orientation and configuration angles
122 throughout the movements, along with the mass centre velocity and whole-
123 body angular momentum about the mass centre (Yeadon, 1990a, 1990c).
124 The time histories of the orientation and configuration angles were fitted using
125 quintic splines (Wood and Jennings, 1979) in order to obtain angle and
126 angular velocity estimates throughout the movements. Although the recorded
127 high jumping performance (Fosbury-flop) was three-dimensional in many
128 respects, the contact phase was essentially planar since the mean deviation
129 from the vertical plane through the mass centre path was less than 5°.

130

131 A planar eight-segment forward dynamics computer simulation model (King et
132 al., 2006) was used (Figure 1) for the foot contact phase in running jumps.
133 The eight segments comprised foot, shank and thigh of the takeoff leg, thigh
134 and shank + foot of the free leg, trunk + head, upper arm and lower arm +
135 hand (representing both arms). Wobbling masses situated within the shank
136 and thigh segments of the takeoff leg and trunk segment and the foot-ground
137 interface were modelled using non-linear spring-damper systems, the visco-
138 elastic parameters for which were determined using an angle-driven version of
139 the model (Wilson et al., 2006). Torque generators, comprising rotational
140 elastic and contractile elements in series, acted around five of the joints
141 (ankle, knee and hip of the takeoff leg; hip of the free leg and shoulder) with
142 extensors and flexors represented separately. The torque produced by a
143 torque generator during a simulation was given by the product of the
144 activation and the maximum voluntary joint torque function (of contractile
145 element angle and angular velocity) whose parameters were determined from
146 dynamometer measurements (King et al., 2006; Yeadon et al., 2006). The
147 activation of each torque generator ranged from 0 to 1 throughout a simulation
148 with the activation at a specific time specified by an activation time history
149 profile. The activation profiles were defined using 6 parameters for the
150 agonists of each joint and 5 parameters for the antagonists of each joint as
151 described in King et al. (2006). The parameters defined the timing of onset of
152 activation, the times to rise and fall between minimum and maximum
153 activation and the levels of minimum and maximum activation. The elbow and

154 free knee joint were driven using splined angle time histories of the recorded
155 jumps.

156

157 *** Figure 1 goes here ***

158

159 Input to the torque-driven model consisted of the kinematics at touchdown and
160 the activation time histories of the 10 torque generators. Model output
161 comprised the time histories of the foot-ground spring-damper displacements,
162 joint angles and trunk orientation from which mass centre position and velocity
163 together with angular momentum about the mass centre were calculated.

164

165 Two simulations which matched the recorded performances of the high jump
166 and long jump during the foot contact prior to takeoff were obtained by varying
167 the torque generator activation profiles in order to minimize the sum of a
168 difference score and various penalties. The difference score for each
169 simulation was the root mean square of six components based on the
170 difference between simulation and performance in terms of (1) trunk
171 orientation, (2) joint angles, (3) time of contact, (4) linear momentum, (5)
172 angular momentum and (6) height / distance travelled in flight (King et al.,
173 2006; Wilson et al., 2007). Penalties were used to ensure that the joint angles
174 remained within anatomical limits. The peak height reached by the mass
175 centre during the flight phase was determined using equations of constant
176 acceleration under gravity along with the height and vertical velocity of the
177 mass centre at takeoff. The horizontal distance travelled by the mass centre
178 during flight was determined using the assumption that the mass centre had

fallen to 0.6 m above the ground at the end of the jump based upon the experimental data collected.

Following the generation of matching simulations for the high jump (match H) and the long jump (match L) four optimizations were carried out. Using the initial conditions from the respective matching simulations the peak height reached by the mass centre in the high jump and the horizontal distance travelled by the mass centre during the flight phase in the long jump were maximized (opt HH and opt LL respectively) by varying the 55 torque activation parameters within the optimization algorithm Simulated Annealing (Corana et al., 1987). A further two optimizations were carried out in which the initial conditions from the matching simulation of the high jump were used in an optimization to maximize jump length (opt HL) and the initial conditions from the matching simulation of the long jump were used in an optimization to maximize jump height (opt LH). Perturbations to joint torque activation timings of the knee and hip were incorporated in the optimization process to ensure that a robust optimum solution was found in each case (Wilson et al., 2007). In particular, the onset timings of the hip and knee extensor torque generators were varied by ± 5 ms producing four additional simulations with the score maximized taken to be the mean score of the four perturbed simulations. In addition in all four optimizations the knee and ankle joint angles of the takeoff leg were constrained to be less than 180° and 160° respectively both at takeoff and during the first 100 ms of the flight phase assuming constant angular acceleration (Wilson et al., 2007).

Results

The recorded high jumping and long jumping performances had similar approach speeds of 7.4 ms^{-1} and 6.9 ms^{-1} respectively but different initial configuration and orientation angles at touchdown (Table 1, Figure 2). The different angles at touchdown resulted in a shallower plant angle of 53° (from the backward horizontal) for the high jump compared to a plant angle of 60° for the long jump.

*** Table 1, Figure 2 go here ***

The matching simulation of the high jump performance resulted in a peak height of 1.98 m compared to the recorded peak height of 2.01 m, a difference score of 6.9% and a horizontal distance travelled of 3.91 m (Table 2, Table 3). The matching simulation of the long jump performance resulted in a horizontal distance travelled of 4.38 m compared to the recorded distance of 4.58 m, a difference score of 10.5% and a peak height of 1.65 m (Table 2, Table 3). The torque activation profiles were similar for the two matching simulations (Figure 3) although the time to peak knee extensor activation was considerably shorter for match L compared to match H (0.051 s compared to 0.097 s) (Table 4).

*** Tables 2 and 3 go here ***

*** Figure 3 goes here ***

In opt HH the optimised peak height reached by the mass centre was 2.09 m which corresponded to an increase of 0.11 m from the matching simulation match H. In opt LL the optimised horizontal distance travelled by the mass centre during the flight phase was 4.67 m which corresponded to an increase of 0.29 m from the matching simulation. Optimising for the opposite performance variable (opt LH and opt HL) had relatively small effects on the peak height (0.02 m) or horizontal distance travelled (0.17 m) by the mass centre during the flight phase (Table 3). The effect of the initial conditions was much larger than the effect of the changed torque generator activation technique with a 0.63 m greater distance travelled in opt LL compared with opt HL even though the approach speed was greater for opt HL (Table 3). The effect of the initial conditions was also greater than that of the takeoff technique for the time of contact, for the mass centre position at takeoff (Table 3), for the knee and hip angle time histories of the takeoff leg (Figure 4) and also the torque activation time histories (Table 4, Figure 5). In particular the time taken for the knee extensors to reach maximum activation was clearly a function of the initial conditions (0.096 s for opt HH / opt HL compared to 0.050 s for opt LL / opt LH). The hip extensor activation time history was largely independent of both initial conditions and takeoff technique in the four optimised simulations (Table 4, Figure 5). Furthermore, the knee angle time histories for the two optimal jumps for height (opt HH and opt LH) had less knee flexion than the equivalent optimal simulation for distance (opt LL and opt HL) with the same initial conditions (Figure 4).

** Table 4 goes here**

** Figures 4 and 5 go here**

Discussion

The aim of this study was to investigate the relative effects of initial conditions and takeoff technique on running jumps for height and distance. A planar eight segment subject-specific computer simulation model was used to simulate running jumps for height and distance with two different sets of initial touchdown conditions and determine robust optimal solutions for height and distance. Overall the effect of initial conditions was much greater than the takeoff technique on the heights reached and distances jumped. The heights and distances achieved in the optimised jumps (opt HH and opt LL) were 0.11 m and 0.29 m greater than the respective matching simulations suggesting that for the given initial conditions the techniques used by the elite high jumper were relatively close to optimal.

The two jumping performances used similar approach speeds but different initial configuration and orientation angles at ground contact (Table 1). The different angles at touchdown resulted in a shallower plant angle of 53° (from the backward horizontal) for the high jump compared to a plant angle of 60° for the long jump. The steeper angle used for the long jumping performance agrees well with previous studies (Alexander, 1988; Hay, 1981) and suggests that the elite high jumper used in this study had appropriate initial conditions for the two jumps. Furthermore, the trunk orientation at touchdown was closer to vertical in the long jumping performance which is in agreement with previous studies (Dapena, 1988; Graham-Smith & Lees, 2005) where a

backward lean at touchdown in the high jump has previously been identified as being advantageous to performance (Dapena, 1988). The clear differences in initial configuration / orientation angles between the two performances and agreement with the literature suggests that the elite high jumper used in this study was able to adopt a close to optimal position at touchdown for each jump while being restricted to use similar horizontal approach speeds. As a consequence it would be expected that even with optimal technique during the takeoff phase it would not be possible to compensate for inappropriate initial conditions when the initial conditions were interchanged (opt HL and opt LH).

The effect of takeoff technique was investigated by keeping the initial conditions fixed and optimising for the alternative performance outcome (opt HL and opt LH). Small effects (Table 3) of less than 0.06 m and 0.17 m difference in the optimal solutions for peak height jumped / distance travelled between opt HH – opt HL and opt LL – opt LH were found. This result confirms that although the takeoff phase is important, it is not possible to make up for inappropriate initial conditions by changing technique. In addition, during the takeoff phase and in contrast to previous literature (Dapena, 1980; Graham-Smith & Lees, 2005), the knee flexed to a greater degree in the optimised long jumping performance (opt LL) compared to the optimised high jumping performance (opt HH) (Figure 4). The reason for the discrepancy may be the approach speeds used in the two optimal simulations were similar when in reality the approach speed used in long jumping is normally considerably faster than in high jumping (Alexander, 1990). In the

current study, comparing opt HH with opt HL and opt LL with opt LH also showed that both optimal simulations for height (with the same approach speed as the optimised simulations for distance) had slightly less knee flexion than the two optimal simulations for distance.

The effect of the initial conditions was investigated by comparing the two optimal solutions for height with different initial conditions (opt HH and opt LH) and the two optimal solutions for distance with different initial conditions (opt LL and opt HL). Both comparisons showed the same trend that the initial conditions were crucial to a successful performance with a 0.27 m difference in jump height (opt HH and opt LH) and a 0.63 m difference in distance jumped (opt LL and opt HL). Consequently to achieve an optimal performance requires an appropriate set of initial conditions at touchdown. The effect of the initial conditions was also evident in the mass centre position at takeoff (Table 3) with the initial conditions for a high jump giving a mass centre position vertically above the foot for match H, opt HH and opt HL, while the initial conditions for a long jump resulted in a mass centre position at takeoff of approximately 0.38 m in front of the toes of the takeoff leg for match L, opt LL and opt LH. This is in agreement with a previous study (Nagano et al., 2007) where in jumps for height the mass centre was above the feet at takeoff, but some distance in front of the feet for jumps for distance and confirms that there is little that can be done during the short contact phase to effect the path of the mass centre during the takeoff phase for a given set of initial conditions at touchdown.

The general applicability of the study is potentially limited by the use of a single elite subject and two performances: a running jump for height and a running jump for distance with similar approach speeds. However, the two performances in terms of initial configurations and orientation have been shown to be consistent with previous studies and have resulted in distinct optimal solutions for height and distance. In conclusion, the results of this study suggest that it is the differences in initial conditions rather than takeoff technique which have the greater influence on optimal jumping performance. It is suggested that this is due to the distinct differences in optimal initial conditions between the two jumps and the relatively short period of time in which the takeoff technique can be adjusted to accommodate for changes in optimal initial conditions. Whilst the takeoff phase is clearly important for the successful performance of a jump and could be considered to be the most important of the three phases of jumping, if the approach phase and the subsequent initial conditions are not close to optimal then a jumper will be unable to compensate for these shortcomings during the short takeoff phase to achieve a jump height or jump distance close to optimum.

References

- Alexander, R. McN., 1990. Optimum take-off techniques for high jumps and long jumps. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London B* 329, 3-10.
- Aura, O., Viitasalo, J.T. 1989. Biomechanical characteristics of jumping. *International journal of Sports Biomechanics*, 5, 89-98.
- Bridgett, L.A., Linthorne, N.P. 2006. Changes in long jump take-off technique with increasing run-up speed. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 24, 889-897.
- Corana, A., Marchesi, M., Martini, C., Ridella, S., 1987. Minimising multimodal functions of continuous variables with the "simulated annealing" algorithm. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software* 13, 262-280.
- Dapena, J. 1980. Mechanics of translation in the fosbury-flop. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise* 12, 37-44.
- Dapena, J. 1988. Biomechanical analysis of the fosbury flop. *Track Technique* 104, 3307-3317.
- van Don, B., Hay, J.G. 1994. Velocity and angular momentum interactions during the takeoff in the long jump. In Blankevoort, L. and Kooloos, J.G.M. (Eds.). *Proceedings of the Second World Congress in Biomechanics* (p. 254), July 10-15, 1994, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
- Graham-Smith, P., Lees, A. 2005. A three-dimensional kinematic analysis of the long jump take-off. *Journal of Sports Sciences* 23, 891-903.
- Greig, M.P. and Yeadon, M.R. 2000. The influence of touchdown parameters on the performance of a high jumper. *Journal of Applied Biomechanics* 16, 367-378.
- Hay, J.G. 1981. Fundamental mechanics of jumping. In Gambetta, V. (Ed.), *Track and field coaching manual* (pp. 148-154). New York: Leisure Press.
- Karara, H.M., 1980. Non-metric cameras. In Atkinson, K. B. (Ed.), *Developments in close range photogrammetry –1* (pp. 63-80). Applied Science Publishers, London.

376 King, M.A., Wilson, C., Yeadon, M.R., 2006. Evaluation of a torque-driven
 377 model of jumping for height. *Journal of Applied Biomechanics* 22, 1-11.

378 Nagano, A., Komura, T., Fukashiro, S., 2007. Optimal coordination of
 379 maximal-effort horizontal and vertical jump motions – a computer
 380 simulation study. *Biomedical Engineering Online*, 6:20.

381 Seyfarth, A., Blickhan, R., Van Leeuwen, J.L. 2000. Optimum take-off
 382 techniques and muscle design for long jump. *Journal of Experimental*
 383 *Biology*, 203, 741 – 750.

384 Wilson, C., Yeadon, M.R., King, M.A., 2006. Determination of subject-specific
 385 model parameters for visco-elastic elements. *Journal of Biomechanics*
 386 39, 1883-1890.

387 Wilson, C., Yeadon, M.R. and King, M.A. 2007. Considerations that affect
 388 optimised simulation in a running jump for height. *Journal of*
 389 *Biomechanics* 40, 3155-3161.

390 Wood, G.A., Jennings, L.S., 1979. On the use of spline functions for data
 391 smoothing. *Journal of Biomechanics* 12, 447-479.

392 Yeadon, M.R., 1990a. The simulation of aerial movement - I: The
 393 determination of orientation angles from film data. *Journal of*
 394 *Biomechanics* 23, 59-66.

395 Yeadon, M.R., 1990b. The simulation of aerial movement - II: A mathematical
 396 inertia model of the human body. *Journal of Biomechanics* 23, 67-74.

397 Yeadon, M.R., 1990c. The simulation of aerial movement - III: The
 398 determination of the angular momentum of the human body. *Journal of*
 399 *Biomechanics* 23, 75-83.

400 Yeadon, M.R., King, M.A., 1999. A method for synchronising digitised video
 401 data. *Journal of Biomechanics* 32, 983-986.

402 Yeadon, M.R., Wilson, C., King, M.A., 2006. Modelling differential activation of
 403 knee joint extensors. *Journal of Biomechanics* 39, 476-482.

404

405

407

Table 1. Initial conditions for matching simulations

variable	high jump	long jump	variable	high jump	long jump
v_{cmx}	7.40 ms^{-1}	6.87 ms^{-1}	$v_{cm y}$	-0.58 ms^{-1}	-0.43 ms^{-1}
θ_a	85°	98°	$\dot{\theta}_a$	201°s^{-1}	28°s^{-1}
θ_k	157°	151°	$\dot{\theta}_k$	-58°s^{-1}	-162°s^{-1}
θ_h	141°	134°	$\dot{\theta}_h$	219°s^{-1}	-28°s^{-1}
θ_s	59°	-20°	$\dot{\theta}_s$	881°s^{-1}	518°s^{-1}
θ_e	92°	116°	$\dot{\theta}_e$	$-1320^\circ \text{s}^{-1}$	156°s^{-1}
θ_m	209°	197°	$\dot{\theta}_m$	-228°s^{-1}	-796°s^{-1}
θ_{rk}	104°	127°	$\dot{\theta}_{rk}$	1271°s^{-1}	-460°s^{-1}
θ_t	80°	91°	$\dot{\theta}_t$	-46°s^{-1}	49°s^{-1}

Note: See Figure 1 for angle definitions, v_{cmx} and $v_{cm y}$ are the horizontal and vertical velocities of the mass centre at touchdown.

408
409
410
411
412

413
414

Table 2. Details of the difference score for the matching simulations

	match H	match L
difference score	6.9%	10.5%
trunk orientation	7.7°	2.6°
joint angles	13.1°	19.0°
contact time	1.1%	11.7%
linear momentum	6.4%	11.4%
angular momentum	0.6%	0.0%
peak height	4.0%	
horizontal distance		4.3%

415
416

417
418
419

Table 3. Mass centre location (CM_x , CM_z) at takeoff [m], horizontal and vertical velocities of the mass centre (VCM_x , VCM_z) at takeoff [ms^{-1}] and the heights and distances jumped [m]

	match H	match L	opt HH	opt LL	opt HL	opt LH
CM_x	0.00	0.37	0.06	0.38	-0.02	0.38
CM_z	1.28	1.20	1.27	1.25	1.29	1.24
VCM_x	4.30	5.72	4.02	5.61	4.27	5.45
VCM_z	3.71	2.98	4.00	3.30	3.91	3.37
height	1.98	1.65	2.09	1.80	2.06	1.82
distance	3.91	4.38	3.87	4.67	4.04	4.59

420
421
422

423
424
425
426

Table 4. Time to maximal activation of the leg joint extensor torque generators

	time to maximal activation [s]					
	match H	match L	opt HH	opt LL	opt HL	opt LH
ankle	0.106	0.154	0.111	0.141	0.120	0.122
knee	0.097	0.051	0.096	0.050	0.096	0.050
hip	0.054	0.051	0.055	0.050	0.053	0.051

427
428

429 List of figure captions

430 Figure 1. Eight segment simulation model. Rigid links between joint centres
431 are shown as straight lines. Wobbling masses within the trunk and
432 plant leg thigh and shank segments are shown with bounding arcs.

433 Figure 2. Orientation and configuration at touchdown for (a) the high jump
434 and (b) the long jump performances.

435 Figure 3. Activation time histories for the ankle, knee and hip extensors
436 (black) and flexors (grey) in the matching simulations.

437 Figure 4. Joint angle time histories of the knee and hip for the four optimised
438 simulations. Initial conditions from the high jump and long jump
439 performances are shown with thick and thin lines respectively and
440 the solid lines correspond to opt HH and opt LL, while the dashed
441 lines correspond to opt HL and opt LH.

442 Figure 5. Activation time histories for the ankle, knee and hip extensors
443 (black) and flexors (grey) in (a) the optimisations for height (opt
444 HH) and distance (opt LL) with the initial conditions for high and
445 long jumps and (b) the optimisations for length (opt HL) and height
446 (opt LH) with the initial conditions for high and long jumps.

447

448

449
450





Figure 1.

465

466



467

468

469

470

471


472

473

474

475 Figure 2.

476



477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487 Figure 3.

488





Figure 4.




Figure 5.